

and Giver of all good things. His delight was, half a century ago, to have a run in the suburbs with Thiers and Beranger, take their ease at an inn, and singing, lead a butterfly life of a few hours. This was different from the raking Sainte-Beuve and Chateaubriand patronized.

Mignet had a speciality for generalization, for *resumé*. He was all thought and research. In his History of the French Revolution from 1789 to 1814, and published in 1824, he treated that epoch of human history for the first time, methodically, scientifically, and philosophically. It was immediately translated into several languages, for it eliminated everything approaching to party spirit. In style, Mignet combined that of Guizot and Macaulay. He was an accomplished essayist as well as historian; as for example, his Lives of Marie Stuart, Franklin and the Abbe Sieyes and other "portraits" of the Academicians. Only he did not paint but sculptured. He produced, not pictures, but statues and busts. Mignet, while taking note of the present, lived in the past, in his souvenirs. Unlike Royer-Collard, he read as well as re-read. Nothing he detested more than improprieties in thought, word and speech. He abhorred anything approaching dirtiness of soul. For Mignet, nobility lay in virtue, and benevolence was the "gown" of the gentleman.

Doctors differ: M. P. L. Boileau, the first economical opinion in France, asserts, despite all make-shifts, the budget for 1884-85 will be in deficit by 180 to 200,000,000; others estimate it lower. M. Rouvier, a ministerialist, maintains there will be an excess—only he does not prove it. The fact is France has arrived at the end of her revenue tether; she has not resources to meet Anemic trade, foreign expeditions, home public works, falling public funds, and wholesale schemes of national education. Then strikes continue to be the flies in the pot of ointment.

The "fit still exists for new foreign possessions. At Tonquin the aim is to bar out the invasion of the celestials. But how long France and China may continue fighting under masks no one can tell. Madagascar, where the French are seemingly blocked rather than the Hovas, who are the foreign-whole island, and is urged to atter. In the interim, of Obock, merely once occupy the port,—"synonymous as a "coaling station" and while thus with "protectorate," dependent of Aden, making France indeff checked on the England could be ea. Jealousy of eastern side of Africa of the day—if it England is the order M. de Lesseps was ever otherwise. of obtaining his has thus no chance elect seven John Suez shareholders to five council, and Bulls on his execut British shippers people ask, will they of the contract accept the portion, table part of Hamlet left out of the port.

The Laundresses, only holiday in Lent day; it is the Friday is that for the year, as Good people endeavor to the butchers. Pe ladies especially, have all their linen, at, as it is pop, back before the earnings washerwomen narily believed the to However, suffer it—for that only. their tribe, ferance is the badge of all links to the George Sand said, that she and her bad washing in Paris, sa linen five friends have to renew their washing times in the year. The bad of chem is simply the employment of hot discals that Zerzelius or Bert when but-covered. There was a time in the tons of shirts only disappeared itself washing; it is now the material and that becomes burned by degrees, a beautifully less. It is not objection, able to make linen white, but ladies have reason to complain, to see their lilac robes returned to them as red as the setting sun. Perhaps we may have in self defense to return to the times of Homer, when the Greeks washed their linen by tramping on it in a stream, as the institution is observed in the north of Scotland. The Egyptians and Hebrews employed a kind of nitre, or a species of soap plant. The Romans employed putrid human urine, and Phiny describes the various systems for accumulating it. The demand for this very peculiar soft soap was such, that the Emperor Vespasian imposed a tax upon it. In Iceland, such is still employed, plus ashes; the latter when from fern are employed in many countries.

The Romans also employed gypsum and chalk, and by the law of Metella,

sulphur fumigations. Alkaline solutions were patronized in France from the fifteenth century, when linen tissues became fashionable. It was under the reign of Charles VI. that an outcry was raised against the Queen Isabella on account of her extravagance in having "two linen chemises." There are at present many substitutes for soap, the chief being, ammonical salts solutions: Indian chestnut meal, rye flour, potato and wheat fecula, boiled potatoes, gelatine and gum. Many employ nettles with akalis to produce a more delicate blue.

In Paris the laundries are as plentiful as the bakeries and drap shops. The public laundries, in special establishments, as well as in the barges on the Seine afford accommodation for 12,000 women. Then the making up represents quite an army, and where men figure as smoothing ironers; similarly as we have the men housemaids. Such a class of subjects naturally have their queens—the fair sex only being elected to royal power as a protest perhaps against the Salique law. Their Majesties are generally buxom and pretty. The poet Dufresny married such a queen accepting the union as a receipt in full for his bill. Pope Sextus the Fifth was of very humble origin, and when elected to the tiara, he brought his sister, who was a laundress, to Rome and lodged her in a palace, for by her brother's elevation, she became a princess by right. Next morning the Romans covered the statue of Pasquins with a soiled chemise. Mafori demanded the cause of such negligence, and the reply was chalked on the statue: "Because my washerwoman has become a princess." The role played by a laundry maid to save the chaste wife of Sir Eustace de Vessy, from being seduced by King John, is well known, and one of the rules exacted from the Crusaders was, that they would observe purity of life towards the washerwomen who followed the army. In France no woman is allowed inside a barracks, and the soldiers have to do their own washing. In the time of Elizabeth no laundress was permitted to enter the precincts of the inns of Court.

Campi who had been condemned to death, but fated not to die, for murdering an old lawyer last August, will go down in the Newgate calendar as a "celebrated" criminal. Save to his lawyer, his identity cannot be established. He conceals his name to avoid the disgrace for his family. Even with a murderer, there is something human in that motive. In the trial a horrible system of espionage was exposed. When a prisoner is arrested, he is given for companion, an inmate whose wretched calling is, to worm himself into the confidence of the prisoner, and report the confession to the authorities, who, as was seen on the trial, employ such evidence against the accused. If the spy, called a *mouton*, does his filthy work well, his term of imprisonment is shortened, or he receives good favors. Campi on receiving sentence observed, "Oh, I have just caught a galloping consumption." His life is already announced, dramatized for the theatre. The man with the "Iron Mask" is only second to the murderer *Sans Nom*.

THE CINCINNATI RIOT.

(New York Herald.)

The riot and bloodshed reported from Cincinnati are simply the results of the outrageous verdict rendered by the jury in the Berner murder case. The crime for which this young man was tried was peculiarly atrocious, and his guilt was exceptionally clear. It was a brutal murder, deliberately committed by the prisoner and another man for the sole purpose of robbery. Their victim was their employer, who was clubbed to death in a stable, and then robbed of a roll of bills which he had in his pocket, amounting to two hundred and forty-five dollars, which was divided between the murderers.

The facts ascertained left no room for doubt as to the guilt of Berner. Indeed, he confessed the crime. On the trial, he confessed that the law were overwhelmingly against him. There seemed to be no escape from conviction of murder in the first degree. It was generally believed that there was no alternative but a verdict of murder or an acquittal, and the latter was deemed wholly out of the question. The jury, however, found the prisoner guilty simply of manslaughter. This unexpected and unwarranted verdict was characterized as "an outrage" by the Judge, and was denounced still more emphatically by the spectators in court. It was universally condemned by the press, and aroused a popular indignation which first broke forth in threats to mob the jury, next found expression in the vast public meeting of Friday night, and finally led to riot and bloodshed.

This outbreak in Cincinnati is not a matter of merely local concern. It springs from a cause of general operation. It is a consequence of a flagrant miscarriage of justice, and both the cause and its effect are growing common throughout the country to an extent that may well cause alarm and arrest attention. The failure to bring murderers to punishment has become so general and so gross, as to call in question the efficacy of our criminal administration, and to sound a warning to the whole nation.

It is a startling fact that escape of murderers from the penalty of the law is the rule, and conviction the exception. A writer in the current number of the *Catury* has collected statistics showing that more than fifteen hundred murders were committed in the United States last year, while the number of legal executions was only ninety-three. One year floods but an approximative ratio of hangings to murders. But the same writer reaches the general conclusion that the number of yearly murders in the country is thirteen to fourteen hundred, and the number of executions less than one hundred. In other words, out of every fourteen murderers only one suffers the extreme penalty of the law, and thirteen escape the gallows. Another post significant fact reported by the same authority is that in 1883 the lynching in the United States outnumbered the legal executions by twenty-five per cent.—there being a hundred and twenty-five of the former, and ninety-three of the latter.

We recently gave in these columns the figures showing that during a period of little more than twenty years—1860-82—a hundred and seventy-two persons were tried in Massachusetts for murder, in the first degree. Of this number only twenty-nine were convicted, and only sixteen hanged. In Connecticut during a period of thirty years—1850-80—of the ninety-seven prisoners tried for murder in the first degree, only thirteen were convicted of that crime, and not more than seven were executed. There were a hundred and eighty-five homicides in New York city during the four years ending with 1877, or an average of nearly one a week. During the same period there were four executions, or just one a year; the number hanged does not average more than two or three.

These are startling facts. They show an alarming defect in our criminal system, and suggest the inquiry whether our laws for the punishment of murderers and the prevention of murder are not made or administered in behalf of criminals rather than in the interest of society. There is no question that these laws are far more favorable to the prisoner than to the people. It is much easier for the defence to escape than it is for the prosecution to secure conviction. The theory of this is that every reasonable safeguard should be thrown around innocent accused. But what is intended as a protection for the innocent has become in the hands of sharp ingenious and oftentimes unscrupulous criminal lawyers a means for effecting the escape of the guilty.

Of all abuses in our criminal administration the most common as well as the most flagrant are the fruits of the present jury system. In nine murder cases out of ten the jury, as is amply proved by experience, is simply a body organized in the interest of criminals. At every stage, from the summoning of the jurors to the rendering of the verdict, the prisoner has advantages and opportunities from which the State is cut off. In the Cincinnati trial, for instance, the defence had five times as many peremptory challenges as the prosecution, and while the prosecutor stood alone during the trial five of the best criminal lawyers at the bar appeared for the prisoner. But making every due allowance for all legitimate advantages enjoyed by the accused and every undue advantage which is secured for him by sharp practice, cases are notoriously common in which the jurors deliberately and fully side with the prisoner out of sympathy with him or through indifference to the claims of society and acquit him against the evidence and in violation of their oath. The outrageous acquittal of Duke, the surprising verdict of the Cincinnati jury in the Berner case and the flagrant results of other recent criminal trials can be explained on this theory.

Lynch law and mob rule are always to be condemned. They are unjustifiable and inexorable even when the results of the strongest provocation and when their avowed aim is to remedy a

flagrant miscarriage of justice. But while juries abuse their powers, travesty the forms of justice and outrage public decency by aiding notorious criminals to escape the just penalty of their crimes, there are likely to be lawless outbreaks here and there of those determined to take the law into their own hands. There was a time when these occurrences were chiefly confined to frontier regions. But they are breaking out in more law-abiding communities. Notable instances of this are the sequel of the Dukes acquitted in Pennsylvania and the consequences of the Berner verdict in Cincinnati. The Cincinnati riot is not to be defended or excused, but it is a warning, and should it have a wholesome effect of the shameful jury abuses throughout the country it will bear at least one good fruit.

Miscellaneous Reading

THE IMPOSSIBLE.

Man cannot draw water from an empty well.
Or trace the stories that gossips tell.
Or gather the sounds of a pealing bell.

Man never can stop the billow's roar,
Nor chain the winds till they blow no more,
Nor drive true love from a maiden's door.

Man cannot o'ertake a fleeting lie,
Change his wheat to a field of rye,
Or call back years that have long gone by.

Man never can bribe old Father Time,
Gain the height of a peak that he cannot climb,
Or trust the hand that hath done a crime.

Man cannot a cruel word recall,
Fetter a thought, be it great or small,
Or honey extract from a drop of gall.

Man can never backward turn the tide,
Or count the stars that are scattered wide,
Or find in a fool a trusty guide.

Man cannot reap fruit from worthless seed,
Rely for strength on a broken reed,
Or gain a heart he hath caused to bleed.

Man never can hope true peace to win,
Pleasure without and joy within,
Living a thoughtless life of sin.

GLADSTONE AND GORDON.

Gladstone is a sincere friend of peace, and this attribute of his character entitles him to the admiration of foreigners as well as the more thoughtful among his own countrymen; but it must be confessed that his policy often seems ill-adapted to secure the object he aims to attain. He is always seeking to avoid a fight, but always allowing himself to be drawn into a situation where it appears to the majority of his countrymen that the national honor will be compromised unless they are allowed to fight. Gladstone was instrumental in sending General Gordon to Khartoum, but would send no army with him. Now Gordon is besieged in Khartoum, and the Mahdi has declared that if he captures Gordon he will put him to death. Does any one believe that if such an event occurs a popular demand will not go up in England for vengeance, or that Gladstone will not yield to it? If, then, a British army is, after all, to be sent up the Nile—and the preponderance of chances are strong in favor of such an event—it is scarcely open to question that prevention would be better than cure. It would be better to protect Gordon living than to avenge him dead. There is no humanity in waiting until Gordon has been killed and then sending a British army to slaughter a few thousand of his enemies as a sacrificial offering upon his tomb. It is possible that when the news of Gordon's death comes, if it does come, Gladstone will breast the storm of popular indignation and refuse to take measures to avenge him, but that is impossible. To do it would require more courage than Gordon needed to undertake the perilous mission that now promises to end in his destruction.—Alta Cal. Apr. 12.

WEAPONS IN COURT.

If the scene in Judge Sullivan's Courtroom, on the 9th April, had occurred in the stirring times along in the fifties, it would not have been looked upon as very extraordinary. Had it happened in Nevada ten years ago, it would not have violated the precedents of sage-brush justice. And it would be regarded as tame and humdrum even at the present day in Arizona, where an important law suit was recently brought to a summary conclusion by a courtroom fight, in which all the parties interested were removed from the scene by a free use of revolvers and bowie knives. But San Francisco is supposed to be far past the times when the spectacle of witnesses and attorneys resting their hands on pistols in readiness to shoot, and a court adjourning to prevent an armed collision, could be calmly contemplated as a matter of course. Such ruffianism is altogether out of place and

season. No court can tolerate it and retain public respect. No person who retains a shred of popular respect can afford to take part in such a scene. It is well known to be the habit of many litigants, witnesses and attorneys to walk into Court armed, but it is all wrong. There should be a rule or a law, without respect to persons, requiring that all weapons should be left at the Court House door. Judge Sullivan has intimated that unless such a disarmament as this can be enforced, he will not go on with the important case he is engaged in trying, and he would be quite right in insisting upon this regulation. Courts of justice are established, in part, for the purpose of preventing people from settling their quarrels by mutual slaughter, and their usefulness terminates if they cannot enforce respect enough to remove the danger of having an appeal taken to the dagger at any moment. If it is necessary to go through the form of holding up and searching every person who enters the Court-room, in order to make certain of his peaceable intentions, it ought to be done. The Constitution of the United States says that the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed, but if the framers of that august document could have foreseen the great scandal trial, they would have excepted Courts of justice from the operation of this rule.—Alta California.

THE PALACE HOTEL.

As a building, the Palace Hotel is an institution of which San Francisco has had good reason to be proud. As a place where ladies and gentlemen should expect cleanly association, the Palace Hotel has not enjoyed good repute. This is largely due to the character of its proprietor. Among the abominations of the trial now in progress, we read of doings at this hotel which are an insult to its inmates and a shameful reflection upon the reckless libertinism of the person who invites the public to make it their home. When Senator Sharon found that advancing years but promoted a growing taste for immorality in him, he should have retired from the Palace and kept his unholy orgies under some other roof. He would have had no precedent for this decency. When Mr. Pearson leased the Baldwin Hotel from Mr. Baldwin, an individual who suffers from Mr. Sharon's disease—he insisted that the Baldwin amourettes should be carried on elsewhere. Baldwin was sensible enough to see the force of Mr. Pearson's arguments, and the blue domino business with which he had filled his leisure hours became a thing of the past in the hotel which bears his name. The result is that the Baldwin is now a respectable family hotel, that the billing and cooing and rear-entrance flirtations have ceased and that ladies can cross its portals without scandal.

We repeat again that it is a crying shame that the Palace Hotel should not be kept on an equally respectable basis. It is an injustice to the many good people who have made it their home that this fine and convenient place should be made a monument to the vices of a profligate and shameless old man. The atmosphere of the establishment is redolent of scandal. The management should see to the purification of the Palace. It is a pretentious house, but its claims to being carefully and scrupulously regarded of the exclusion of all improper characters are not well sustained. Let it begin with insisting upon the retirement of its proprietor, who is the weightiest scandal it has to carry.

We sincerely hope that the combined opinion of its respectable inmates will insist that the house be kept as a decent hotel—that those practices which have made it notorious shall cease, that its corridors shall be purified from the vice, open and flagrant, which has made itself manifest to even the casual guest, and that it shall bear credit and not a reproach to the city of San Francisco.—Wasp.

Mary Anderson has made the necessary protest against the many matrimonial paragraphs which are certainly beginning to do her harm, as there was an uneasy impression that they were advertising puffs sent out by injudicious friends. She protests that they are the productions of an enemy. As proof of the good will she enjoys among her profession, she mentions that she received 800 letters after her professional matinee. She is tired after her long engagement, and rejoices at the prospect of a rest.